

U.S.S.N. 09/584,012

6

PD-200031

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application.

In the Office Action dated December 23, 2003, claims 1-18 are pending in the application. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 14, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Schmidt*, et al. (5,940,774) in view of *Kao* (6,175,737).

Applicants have amended claims 1, 8 and 16 in a similar manner. Claim 1 had been emphasized to clarify the roll of the central processing hub in that the central processing hub provides time delays to the radiated signal so that they arrive coherently at the mobile terminals. In the return direction, the signals transmitted from mobile users are compensated at the central processing hub not by the mobile terminals. This allows the mobile terminals to be simple so that a no compensation for time delays on the return link at the mobile terminal needs to be performed. Likewise, the individual transponding nodes are also advantageously simple and, thus, do not have to compensate for time delays therein. The time delays are compensated for an essential processing hub. Figure 4 generates the post-processor 44. The present claims are different than the diversity system described in the *Schmidt* reference. The present application coherently adds the radiated signals from the individual transponding nodes. Thus, if one of the signals from the one of the nodes (of which there would be typically many), only gradual degradation would be formed. The time delays are added to each of the signals at the central processing to compensate for time delays so the signals arrive at the same time at the mobile terminals.

In the diversity system, such as *Schmidt*, one signal is typically selected over another signal based on various conditions such as signal strength. As described in the *Schmidt* reference in col. 8, lines 38-36, various weights may be assigned to the different signals. The signals are, however, not coherently added. Further, the *Schmidt* reference does not teach or suggest the post-processing aspect as now recited in the claims. That is, the mobile terminals do not acquire compensation for the time delays rather the central processing hub compensates for time delays in the return signals. This simplifies the circuitry involved with the mobile terminals. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration of the independent claims.

U.S.S.N. 09/584,012

7

PD-200031

Claims 2, 3, 5, 10-13, 15 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schmidt* in view of *Kao* and *Ibanez-Meier* (5,949,766). The *Ibanez-Meier* reference also fails to teach or suggest the missing elements now recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 16.

In light of the remarks above, Applicants submit that all objections and rejections are now overcome. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


Georgann S. Grunebach
Reg. No. 33,179

Date: March 2, 2004

DIRECTV
2250 E. Imperial Highway
El Segundo, CA 90245
310-964-4615